

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. JAVITS, Mr. President, in view of the statement on U.S. foreign policy issued yesterday by the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership and the newspaper reports of Senator DRISKEN's denial that this means a break in the bipartisan policy on foreign affairs, I wish to reaffirm that as a Republican running for reelection I am standing by the Vandenberg bipartisan foreign policy and will support the administration on foreign policy where I consider the policy to deserve it, without regard to party affiliation.

However, I believe that it is the duty of a Member of the Congress to propose alternatives and, in that spirit, I myself have proposed them as they related to the administration policy on Berlin and Israel and the Near East and other issues. I believe that such alternatives are a needed accompaniment in the formulation of the bipartisan foreign policy, and I look forward to the substitute proposals to be presented by the Republican leadership in this spirit, which, I repeat, is in the spirit of Arthur Vandenberg, one of the most distinguished Members of the Senate in our history.

I ask unanimous consent that a news article quoting the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DRISKEN] which appeared in today's New York Herald Tribune be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GOP CHIEFS BLAST KENNEDY'S CONCESSIONS AND RETREATS

(By Robert C. Toth)

WASHINGTON—Republican congressional leaders yesterday assailed the Kennedy administration for "concessions and retreats" in American foreign and nuclear testing policies.

The nine-member GOP House and Senate leadership group, exercising its "right and responsibility to disagree," attacked administration actions from Laos and the Congo to Berlin and Cuba.

"By any reasonable standard," Senate GOP whip, Senator M. DRISKEN said, "the administration's record in foreign affairs shows lack of understanding and initiative, the absence of an overall policy, and a tendency toward concession rather than standing on principle."

House GOP leader, CHARLES E. HALLUCK charged that the recent United States-British proposal to test for a limited test ban without inspection "was the latest in a series of concessions and retreats" of President Kennedy's term.

"We believe this retreat from the absolutely essential condition of inspection is a mistake of major dimensions," he said. The Republican leaders, he added, want the offer withdrawn "immediately."

ALTERNATE PLANS

Senator DRISKEN denied that the attack meant a definite break with the administration on foreign policy, however. "We want to be heard," he said. "We want an opportunity to submit substitute proposals."

He said alternates to the administration's policies will be put forth by the Republicans "before the week is out."

On the nuclear testing issue, the United States and Britain proposed two treaties on Monday in Geneva. The first was a comprehensive test ban covering tests in all environments and containing provisions for inspection of Soviet territory to check on suspected cheating.

The second was a limited treaty proposal to ban tests anywhere except underground. No inspection provisions were contained because the administration believes inspection is necessary only for underground tests.

HALLUCK'S OBJECTION

Representative HALLUCK objected to the second plan, contending it would have no value in preventing secret preparations for future testing.

"In effect we are now being told that half a loaf is better than none," he said. "We say that no agreement at all is better than a bad one."

The Soviets already have rejected both proposed treaties.

In foreign policy, Senator DRISKEN cataloged a long list of complaints accruing over 18 months. He applauded the stand the United States has taken in Vietnam.

"But in contradictory fashion, we have promoted establishment of a highly suspect coalition government in Laos, participated in the delivery of West New Guinea into the hands of Indonesia without a vote of the people, and stood passively by while India by force of arms seized Goa, a Portuguese possession," he said.

In Africa, Senator DRISKEN added, the administration supported armed intervention by the United Nations in the Congo and voted against its NATO ally, Portugal, on her African colony of Angola in a U.N. resolution.

In Europe, "our Berlin stand, while generally commendable," has been accompanied by emphasis on conventional forces as contrasted to prior emphasis on nuclear arms. This has "created serious distrust on the part of our allies, West Germany and France."

"In this hemisphere, the Cuban fiasco, the Peruvian diplomatic blunder, and the foundering of the Alliance for Progress have done much to impair our efforts in Latin and South America."

Finally Senator DRISKEN charged, "many of the administration's foreign policy advisers believe the Soviet Union is 'maturing' and that a policy of concession will hasten the process."

"This is a miscalculation that should be rapidly remedied. The Berlin wall, Soviet shipments to Cuba, and Communist action in Vietnam show that the cold war is just as intense and menacing today as it has been anytime since it began 17 years ago."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand that the time on the Independent Offices appropriation bill will be up at 4:30 p.m. My colleague [Mr. KEATING] has been waiting a long time to speak. He informs me that he needs 15 or 20 minutes. Would the Senator from Wisconsin object to a unanimous-consent request to extend the time for 5 minutes more?

Mr. PROXMIER. I do not mind a bit. I shall go through my amendment as rapidly as I can. I have 20 or 25 minutes more to go. Many Senators are waiting to vote and leave. If no Senator objects, I am willing to do as the Senator has requested.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is 12 minutes before the hour of 4:30, when the time expires. If the time is extended 5 minutes and the Senator from New York takes 15 minutes, it leaves no time on the bill. This bill is an important bill, as has been demonstrated by the great variety of amendments which have been offered this afternoon.

I should like to ask the Senator to modify his request, or I will request that the unanimous-consent request be modified, for an extension of 1 hour, so that the Senator from New York may have 15 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may need 20 minutes. I shall not take that much if I do not need it, but I intend to speak on a subject which I believe is of great importance.

Mr. ALLOTT. The chairman of the subcommittee is not in the Chamber. As the ranking minority member of it, I hope I may take the responsibility of adding the extra 5 minutes, and I will take that responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator repeat the request? Is it for an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. ALLOTT. The request is for an additional hour on the bill, and then whatever time the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee yields to the Senator from New York is entirely up to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have been waiting all day. I rarely would be as insistent as I am. I am about to speak on something that I believe is of interest to Members of the Senate. It has to do with the situation in Cuba. It is a matter of urgency and importance, and I would like to have it understood that I may have 20 minutes to discuss it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington has just entered the Chamber, so I will leave the decision to him. He is in control of the time on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is time. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes remain.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent to extend the time on the bill by 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One hour from 4:30.

Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

SOVIET ACTIVITIES IN CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have prepared some remarks for delivery today on the subject of Cuba and the activities of Russian military personnel, which are probably in an effort to interfere with our operations at Cape Canaveral.

This morning additional facts came to my attention which indicate the danger of the stepped-up flow of Soviet so-called technicians to Cuba and the threat which their activities pose to the security of the United States, largely as a result of their effort to interfere with our operations at Cape Canaveral.

I am reliably informed—when I say "reliably informed," I mean that has been checked out from five different sources; and I am certain I can state it as a fact—that between the dates of August 4 and August 15, 10, or 12 Soviet vessels anchored at the Marine dock area at Matanzas. The dock area previously had been surrounded by the construction of a high cinder-block wall. The Soviet ships unloaded 1,200 troops. Troops is what I mean, and not technicians. They were wearing Soviet fatigue uniforms.

On August 13 five Soviet torpedo boats unloaded from Soviet ships, and are now moored at La Base. There is every indication that the naval complement to handle these boats disembarked at the same time.

Again let me emphasize that these could not reasonably be called technicians.

On August 13, 1,000 non-Cuban personnel in fatigue uniforms were seen working in the area near Finca La Guatana, in all probability on or near a missile base located in that area.

On August 8 a large convoy of military vehicles manned by Soviet personnel was observed on the highway in Las Villas Province. The convoy moved in military order and contained the first amphibious vehicles observed in Cuba; also jeeps, 6 x 6 trucks, and tracked trucks.

On August 5 there was a movement seen of a 64-vehicle convoy heading west on Carretera Central. The convoy was moving in military order. It included tanks, cannonlike trailers, and flatbed trailers.

On August 8 there was observed a night movement of a convoy on Carretera Central. Flatbed trucks were observed transporting concave metal structures supported by tubing. The convoy included a number of closed vans. The convoy appeared to be moving toward an installation 4 to 5 kilometers from Canimar in a closely restricted area believed to contain a rocket installation.

There have been other observations of activities there, which have been confirmed.

On July 27 the unholy alliance between Castro's Cuba and the Soviet Union took its most serious turn. Between July 27 and August 15 their joint activities have been coordinated in an alarming way, which poses a serious threat to the security of the Western Hemisphere.

So far no action has been taken by our Government. The President has said that he has no evidence of Soviet troops in Cuba. If he has no evidence, I am giving him evidence this afternoon, Mr. President.

The American people have not been informed of the dangerous situation which exists 90 miles off our mainland.

Mr. President, the American people are asking with new urgency: What is going on in Cuba? So far the answers received are unsatisfactory.

Since July the Soviet Union has sent the ships of men and equipment. Most of the 20 large ships have arrived. The Communist ports in the last few weeks. Many have been unloaded under maximum security. Between three and five thousand so-

called "technicians" have arrived in the course of the past year. Soviet statistics reveal that by the end of the year the Soviets will have shipped nearly \$1 billion of goods and equipment to Castro; Cuban trade with non-Communist countries will be down to about 30 percent this year and Cuba will be virtually isolated from the free world. Communist enclave within the free world where the Soviets can operate unchecked and to a large extent unobserved.

What are the Soviets planning to do with their new island fortress? It is hardly a showplace of communism, since conditions there are worse now than they have been in years. What are they going to build with all this new equipment? What will the army of technicians be required to maintain? So far we have had a number of answers, but in my judgment, none of them tell the true story.

Tass, the Soviet press agency, has announced that the shipments consist of industrial equipment, flour, food, and fertilizer and that the "technicians" are agricultural experts and economists who will try to get the faltering Cuban economy back on its feet. That is not true, Mr. President.

There is no doubt that Cuba needs food and needs expert help. Castro and his fellow travelers have plunged the country into a state of depression, privation, and hardship that has not been matched for generations. But the Communists are not known for their humanitarian motives and impulses. I for one very much doubt that the Soviets are sending any large amount of food to Cuba, which is in short supply, to help Castro out of his difficulties.

More ominous reports suggest that the Soviets are constructing missile bases and sending over technicians and experts to man them. In this way the Soviets could expect to discourage determined refugees of other nations of this hemisphere from any kind of concerted attack on the Cuban dictatorship. They could also strengthen Castro to resist any internal dissatisfaction against his regime. That suspicion which our Government has never openly admitted or discussed, is a source of serious concern to the people of all the Americas. It should be fully aired. The dangers inherent in the situation should be known and appreciated by all the people of this hemisphere, and particularly by those nations which so far have actively blocked measures to combat the menace of Castroism.

Another very real possibility and, in my judgment, a probability that should be a source of even greater concern to the United States and which has so far not been openly discussed at all in this country is that the Soviets are deliberately taking advantage of the proximity between Cuba and Cape Canaveral to conduct other activities. There is no question at all of the possibility of interference with American space flights by Soviet missiles and by Soviet ships and operated by Communist experts. It is entirely possible for any nation with the advanced electronic resources which the Soviet Union now possesses to con-

struct elaborate and sensitive listening devices. Such devices could monitor all the direct communications and other radio signals used to control missiles in the early stages of flight. With skill and effort, it would be very possible for the Soviets to duplicate these signals. Thus they might be able to alter the direction, they throw the space missile to defeat completely the purpose of any launching.

At the most, what this means is that U.S. astronauts to be launched in the future could be sitting ducks for any kind of interference the Soviets might want to stage. At the very least, it means we must move urgently to develop the techniques necessary to combat this kind of Soviet interference. At the very least, it is an additional hazard, an additional delay, and an additional expense that we will have to face in the space race.

The other possibility, of moving our launching site from Cape Canaveral, would be an equally difficult operation that would slow down our program substantially. Moreover, Cape Canaveral offers advantages, in its eastern outlook, its proximity to the equator, and its relative remoteness from heavily built up areas, that would be hard to duplicate anywhere in the country.

Mr. President, let me make this clear. So far, there is no evidence to indicate that the Russians have yet played any part in the rather alarming number of launch failures at Cape Canaveral. But I have spoken with a number of technical experts in this field both in and out of Government. All agree that saving dropping and actual interference in U.S. launchings is entirely within the capability of the Soviet Union. And we all know that it is just the kind of thing that might be expected of the Soviets.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that such an effort would be expensive. But we all know that right now the Soviets are spending more money just to jam our Voice of America programs than we spend on our entire Information Agency budget. How much more worthwhile, from their point of view, it would be to take advantage of the strategic location of Cuba, less than a hundred miles from our critical launching facilities, to put additional roadblocks in the way of our space program and thereby guarantee Soviet success in reaching the moon, and other objectives, first.

In my judgment, Mr. President, all the Soviet equipment, which undeniably includes radar and other electronic devices, is not only to prop up Castro economically; it is not only to build missile bases, which could easily be activated; but it is also designed deliberately to put the Communists in a position where they can interfere with the American space effort at Cape Canaveral. The thousands of technicians are arriving, not only to teach the Cubans how to build their economy, not only to fight dissidents, not only to discourage common action by all the nations of this hemisphere, but above all to build and to man espionage and intelligence stations and to keep a constant eye on, and very possibly also, a finger in, the important U.S. launchings scheduled to take place.

Canaveral through the coming year. The President, for the American Government as to what the real danger of the Communist buildup in Cuba is. Our present policy is just to let the other way in the hope that Castro will just disappear. The influx of Soviet men and technicians shows what a vain, blind, and misleading hope this has been. Castro is not a bad dream or a nightmare that will go away when morning comes. He is a dangerous reality. He will go away merely because we rub a lamp and wish for his disappearance. And he is not very likely to fall, no matter how much he abuses and antagonizes the people of Cuba, for the Soviet forces that stand behind him are now too much for mere refugees and rebels of the Cuban people.

Therefore, at this point, Mr. President, Castro has virtually handed the Communist a gigantic monkey wrench that can be turned right through the middle of our entire space effort, that can endanger the lives of our astronauts, and that can critically slowdown vital defense developments. It is time for the people of this country and of this hemisphere to have the truth, the whole truth, about what Castro, and his Soviet cohorts, are up to. Only with full knowledge of the seriousness of the situation can we develop a strong national policy with the support of the people of the United States.

Our present look-the-other-way policy in Cuba depends to a large extent on popular ignorance of the facts and wishful underestimation of the dangers that are involved. Will we have to wait until more and more of our launchings at Canaveral go wrong before we suspect the worst? Will we have to wait until the Russians have established a space monopoly before we weigh the dangers of their activities in Cuba? Will we have to wait until Castro dies of old age before we recognize that the Soviet stronghold which is being established at this minute on the island of Cuba is undoubtedly a loaded gun that can be aimed directly at our military and space efforts?

Mr. President, the time for the truth is now and I hope the American people will be provided with the truth while there is still time to deal with it, before it is too late.

In my judgment, the first step which should be taken immediately would be to present the matter to the Organization of American States. We should lay the facts before them, and urge upon them the necessity for prompt and vigorous action in a concerted way to meet this threat to their future security as well as to the security of the United States. Time is short. The situation is growing worse. I urge upon my Government this prompt action be taken.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963. (H. R. 13711) making appropriations for sundry independent execu-

tive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; and for other purposes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER].

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the pending amendment would cut back the NASA appropriation about 5 percent below the budget estimate. It would cut it back \$188 million. It would also cut it about \$105 million below the Senate recommendation, which is below the estimate.

I offer the amendment because the appropriation is still more than 100 percent higher than it was last year. The NASA appropriation is still the most rapidly rising cost of our Federal Government by far.

I am deeply concerned about the impact of the huge increase in spending for space and the projected future space budget. I am concerned particularly about the impact of the spending on the Nation's other vital needs and goals.

I emphasize at the beginning that I do not question the importance of our space effort. I support it warmly. I favor the manned lunar probe enthusiastically. The significant question is not whether our Nation should undertake a space program. Of course it should. But the question is rather whether or not we have the responsibility of considering the space program carefully and thoughtfully, and pruning out expenditures which I think we can show would be either duplication or wasteful.

One of the basic responsibilities of Congress is the designation of funds for various programs, taking account of priority and the amount of money which can be wisely spent in any program.

It is my firm belief that money is being poured into NASA without a reasonable examination of the scale, and with priorities being made at a faster rate by far than can be prudently used. As a result, fiscal precaution is being thrown to the winds in our Nation's space program.

The available evidence points to one example after another of a disturbing lack of concern about cost and basic budget discipline in this program.

The amendment is designed to provide some of that discipline by forbidding some of the conspicuous examples of waste. It is not a meat ax by any means; it is a scalpel.

SPECIFIC PROXMIER RESEARCH OPERATION REDUCTIONS IN SPACE SPENDING

Referring to the first part of my amendment under research, development and operation at NASA, particularly pertaining to aircraft technology, the NASA budget request would provide funds in the amount of \$18 million for defense research on supersonic commercial transports. That research was part of the civilian "fallout" of the RS-70 program for which Congress appropriated \$362 million under the Defense Department appropriation bill heavily \$200 million over the budget request. I might add at the present time, both NASA and the Federal Aviation Admin-

istration are carrying on research on supersonic transports. In the present bill FAA requests about \$25 million for the purpose and NASA about \$23 million.

Even though the feasibility of a commercial supersonic transport has not yet been shown, we are already pouring money into this project.

It seems to me that the wise thing to do is to wait for the further development of the RS-70, for which we are paying so much, and let NASA go ahead and conduct its B-58 and B-70 flight simulations of supersonic transport operation, for which more than \$3 million is provided in the present NASA budget, before we become too committed financially. After these developments, and tests, we will have a better idea of the feasibility of a commercial supersonic transport. Accordingly, my amendment provides for the reduction of NASA's funds for advanced research on a supersonic commercial transport from \$18 million down to \$3 million.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who is a very able member of the Appropriations Subcommittee which handled this matter.

Mr. ALLOTT. I will not address myself to the merits of the supersonic aircraft development program. I should like to point out that this is not a part of the NASA appropriation. It is a part of the Federal Aviation Agency appropriation. I believe if the Senator will refer to page 27 of the report, he will find that it is listed there as the last item under the Federal Aviation Agency appropriation.

Mr. PROXMIER. The Senator from Colorado is referring to another section of the bill. I call attention to page 79 of the report of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. At the bottom of the page, under the heading of "Supersonic Commercial Transport Advanced Research," there is the figure, for 1963, of \$18 million. Under VSTOL aircraft the figure is \$4,500,000. The total is \$30 million. I would cut it back to \$8,500,000. The fact is this is part of the NASA budget, no question about it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I cannot find the page the Senator refers to. First I should like to say that basic research in supersonic aircraft is going on in two places, one in the Defense Department, with which the Senator is completely acquainted, and has discussed many times. The other is in the Federal Aviation Agency. It is the last line item in the Federal Aviation Agency appropriation.

Mr. PROXMIER. That is correct. However, there is also an item under the NASA authorization. It was untouched in the appropriation bill to which I have referred, providing for \$18 million for supersonic commercial transports. It is on page 79 of the report. We can come back to this item later. Along the same line, NASA is carrying on research on the short-takeoff-and-landing STOL and the vertical-takeoff-and-landing VTOL aircraft developed by the military. NASA is carrying on the research to determine